

Remarks/Arguments:

This amendment adds no new claims, and is provided to amend the specification and claim 2. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2 and 4 will be pending.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 2 for the following informalities. The Examiner has suggested that in claim 2, line 6, the phrase --selection of a threshold value--, should be changed to, "selection of threshold values", and that the specification should be amended to reflect such a change. The Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has also suggested that in claim 2, line 8, the phrase --as threshold values--, should be changed to, "as said threshold values", and that the specification should be amended to reflect such a change. The Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has also suggested that in claim 2, line 11, the phrase --on threshold values to be selectively--, should be changed to, "on said threshold values selectively", and that the specification should be amended to reflect such a change. The Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has also suggested that in claim 2, line 13, the phrase --the receiving data--, should be changed to, "the received data", and that the specification should be amended to reflect such a change. The Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner. The above amendments are not new matter and are described in the text and figures (see page 6, line 6-14, and Fig. 2, elements 14, 16, 183 and 191).

Further, the Examiner points to claim 2, lines 17-18 as being unclear. The Examiner has suggested that in claim 2, lines 17-18, the phrase --the offset value selectively outputted from said reference data selecting unit--, should be changed to, "the offset value when the reference data selecting unit selectively outputs, the threshold value and the offset value, as said threshold values", and that the specification should be amended to reflect such a change. The Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner. This is not new matter and is described in the text and figures (see page 8, lines 13-15, and Fig. 2, elements 16 and 183).

The Examiner has the same comment regarding claim 2, lines 23-24. The Examiner has suggested that in claim 2, lines 23-24, the phrase --the threshold value selectively outputted from said reference data selecting unit, thereby determining--, should be changed to, “the *offset* value when the reference data selecting unit selectively outputs, the threshold value and the offset value, as said threshold values, thereby determining”, and that the specification should be amended to reflect such a change.

The Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner, with the following exception. Claim 2, line 24 recites that the determining unit compares the output signal with “the *threshold* value”, not “the *offset* value”. This is not new matter and is described in the text and figures (see page 8, lines 18-21, and Fig. 2, elements 16 and 191). The Applicants have replaced the phrase --the threshold value selectively outputted from said reference data selecting unit, thereby determining--, with, “the *threshold* value when the reference data selecting unit selectively outputs, the threshold value and the offset value, as said threshold values, thereby determining”, and the specification has been amended to reflect such a change.

Additionally, the Examiner has pointed to the offset value for comparison in claim 2, lines 17-18, as being unclear. Specifically, the Examiner states that it is unclear whether this is the stored offset value of claim 2, line 9, or the external offset value of claim 2, line 10. The Applicants point out that the offset value for comparison in claim 2, lines 17-18, refers to the offset value that is selectively output by the reference data selecting unit, which can comprise either the stored offset value of claim 2, line 9, or the external offset value of claim 2, line 10. This is not new matter, and is described in the specification at page 6, lines 6-11. The Examiner has the same comment regarding the threshold value for comparison in claim 2, lines 24-25. As noted above, the threshold value for comparison in claim 2, lines 24-25, refers to the threshold value that is selectively output by the reference data selecting unit, which can comprise either the stored threshold value of claim 2, lines 8-9, or the external threshold value of claim 2, lines 9-10.

Conclusion

The amendments made in this response are fully responsive to the requirements set forth in the Ex parte Quayle office action by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the application be passed to issue.

Application No. 09/917,698
Amendment dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Ex parte Quayle Action of November 29, 2005

If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the undersigned at 202-659-9076.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald S. Grubb
Ronald S. Grubb
Attorney for the Applicants
Reg. No. 48,672

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-9076

Dated: January 30, 2006